



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,696	06/13/2002	Dimitri Donskoy	7604/21/1	3736

20694 7590 03/24/2004

WOLFF & SAMSON, P.C.
ONE BOLAND DRIVE
WEST ORANGE, NJ 07052

EXAMINER


SAINT SURIN, JACQUES M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2856

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>10/069,696 </p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>DONSKOY ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Jacques M Saint-Surin</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2856</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22,24-33 and 35-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22,24-33 and 35-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment of 11/28/03.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, 11-12, 17, 19-22, 27, 29-33, 38 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rudd (US Patent 4,554,836).

Regarding claim 1, Rudd ('836) discloses an electromagnetic wave vibrometer apparatus (laser vibrometer 10, see; Fig. 1 and col. 2, line 24) comprising:

a signal generator (signal generator 22, see: Fig. 1 and col. 2, line 36) for generating an electromagnetic signal;

a modulator for amplitude modulating the electromagnetic signal to produce an amplitude modulated signal (acoustic-optic modulator or Bragg cell 16, see: Fig. 1 and col. 2, line 30) Note that a Bragg cell is known in the art as device for frequency shifting and/or amplitude modulating optical waves;

a transmitter (transducer 20, see: Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 36-37) for transmitting the signal at a vibrating object (object surface 28, see: Fig. 1 and col. 3, line 59);

a receiver (photodetector 32, see: Fig. 1 and col. 3, line 40) for receiving a reflected phase and amplitude modulated signal from the vibrating object (28) and col. 4, lines 3-5 discloses the displacement d is indicative of the amplitude of ultrasonic vibration on surface 28;

a demodulator (phase demodulator 42 tuned to the acoustic modulation frequency and connected to detector 32 will produce an analog signal E' which is

Art Unit: 2856

indicative of the actual displacement of vibrating surface 28, see: col. 4, lines 5-9) for demodulating the phase and amplitude modulated signal, a phase demodulator 42; and a signal processor (visual display and recording device such as oscilloscope or minicomputer, see: col. 4, lines 18-23) for analyzing the vibration waveform of the demodulated signal.

Regarding claim 11, it is an apparatus claim that recites the same limitations of the device claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the reasons set forth for that claim.

Regarding 21, it is a method claim that recites the steps for performing the functions of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the reasons set forth for that claim.

Regarding claim 32, it is a method claim that recites the steps for performing the functions of claim 1. As discussed above, it is rejected for the reasons set forth for that claim. Furthermore, Rudd discloses a phase demodulator 42 tuned to the acoustic modulation frequency, e.g. 40 MHz and connected to photodetector 32 will produce an analog signal E' which is indicative of the actual displacement of vibrating surface 28, see: col. 4, lines 5-9.

Regarding claims 2, 12, 22 and 33, Rudd discloses a laser beam for use as an optical, ultrasonic transducer, see: col. 1, lines 51-52.

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27 and 38, Rudd discloses a laser signal source 12, see: Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 9, 19, 30 and 42, Rudd discloses a second vibration receiver (photodiode 36, see: Fig. 1) mounted with the first receiver 32 for compensation for unwanted background or coupled vibration.

Art Unit: 2856

Regarding claims 10, 20, 31 and 43, Rudd discloses a focusing lens 26 that may be a microscope objective lens and is adjustable along the optical axis means of beam B, see: col. 3, lines 6-10.

Regarding claims 29 and 41, Rudd discloses due to this arrangement, it is straight light, as indicated by the arrows S in Fig. 1, from beam A which actually impinges on the photosensitive region 38 along with beam D, this offset arrangement tends to equalize the intensities of the incident beams and prevents saturation of the photodiode 36, see: col. 3, lines 53-57.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 3-6, 13-16, 24-26 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudd (US Patent 4,554,836) in view of Kljuev et al. (US Patent 4,481,825).

Claims 3-4, 13-14, 24 and 35 differ from Rudd by reciting a microwave frequency signal. Kljuev ('825) discloses a microwave generator transmitting microwave energy through an antenna a microwave generator transmitting microwave energy through an antenna system to an object to be the antenna system includes an elliptical mirror having a second focal point in the immediate vicinity of the object being investigated, while the radiator is located in the first focal point close to the mirror, said radiator irradiating the whole surface of said mirror (see: col. 2, lines 11-13 and col. 2, lines 11-23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize in Rudd the microwave of Kljuev as taught above because it would include an optical guidance used for aiming the mirror of the antenna at the object being investigated thereby the combination would be able to provide a device for

Art Unit: 2856

measurement of vibrations which ensures good resolution and sensitivity when a large-size object to be measured is located at a considerable distance from the device in a reliable manner.

Claims 5-6, 15-16 and 25-26 and 36-37 differ from Rudd by reciting a combination of optical and microwave signals. Kljuev et al. ('825) discloses the optical system 20 comprises an objective 22 located on the axis 21 of the mirror 7 in from of the reflector 10 of the radiator 8 as viewed from the investigated object 5, a light guide 23 for transmission of the image of the object 5 (see: col. 4, lines 11-15). Kljuev et al. ('825) further discloses the microwave energy of the generator is transmitted through the waveguide system 3 to the radiator 8 irradiating the entire surface of the mirror 7 of the antenna system (see: col. 4, lines 59-62). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to recognize the advantages of utilizing in Rudd et al. the techniques of Kljuev et al. as taught above because the optical guidance of the device provides high accuracy of aiming the device at any section of the object under study thereby, making the above combination more effective and reliable.

5. Claims 8, 18, 28 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudd (US Patent 4,554,836) in view of Flock et al. (US Patent 5,897,494).

Regarding these claims, although Rudd discloses a laser source, it does not specifically disclose or suggest a LED signal source. Flock et al. ('494) discloses a diode laser source 10, see: Fig. 1. Note that in lightwave transmission systems, light emitting diodes or lasers are used as sources of light and these devices are fabricated

Art Unit: 2856

from multilayered structures of compounds semiconductors epitaxially grown on a single-crystal substrate. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize in Rudd the light emitting diode of Flock et al. as taught above because the LED are used as sources for optical data link applications in which the data rates are less than about 500 megabits per second and the transmission distances do not exceed a few kilometers and moreover, they use less power than normal incandescent light bulbs thereby, making the above combination more efficient.

6. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudd (US Patent 4,554,836) in view of Wang et al. (US Patent 5,495,767).

This claim differs from Rudd by reciting wherein the generated signal is split into first and second signals and the second signal is transmitted to a demodulator for comparing the second signal with the received reflected signal. Wang et al. discloses a beam splitter 14, see: Fig. 1 and col. 2, line 3. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Rudd the beam splitter of Wang et al. as taught above because the beam splitter is known for reflecting a first portion of a beam and is also common knowledge in the art and are readily commercially available.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

REMARKS

8. In response to applicant's argument "Each of these claims recites the limitation of amplitude modulating an electromagnetic signal prior to transmitting the signal to a source, and receiving and processing phase-amplitude modulated signals reflected from the source to determine the object's vibrations and characteristics", Rudd discloses in col. 2, lines 30-32 an acoustic-optic modulator of Bragg cell 16 is disposed in the path of beam A. Moreover, the modulator 16 or Bragg cell is well known in the art as a device for frequency shifting and/or amplitude modulating optical waves, as stated above. Clearly, the modulator 16 is inherently an amplitude modulator.

9. In response to applicant's argument "Rudd, discussed earlier, frequency modulates a probe prior to transmission of the signal, and fails to teach or suggest amplitude modulating a signal" and "Likewise, Kliueva et al. is absent and teaching" suggestion, or motivation for amplitude modulating a signal prior to transmission of the signal", as stated above, the modulator 16 is prior to the transmission signal and well known in the art as amplitude modulator.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lewis et al. (US Patent 6,545,762) discloses a method of investigating vibrations and an apparatus therefore.

Pejic (US Patent 6,067,013) discloses a method and device for indicating a referee signal.

Art Unit: 2856

Steinlechner et al. (US Patent 5,883,715) discloses a laser vibrometer for vibration measurements.

Pepper et al. (US Patent 5,585,921) discloses a laser-ultrasonic non-destructive non-contacting inspection system.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques M Saint-Surin whose telephone number is (703) 308-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (703) 305-4705. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2856

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 0956.



Jacques M. Saint-Surin
March 21, 2004



HEZRON WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800